mechanical CAD drawings and the only handwritten element in all twenty-one figures relate to the connection of the igniter **150** and a representative circuit **152** which are described in detail and referenced to Figure 19 in paragraph 48 as originally submitted. The hand-drawn elements appear to be pretty legible.

Nevertheless, enclosed in Exhibit C are copies of the drawings as originally provided for the Examiner's review which are believed to support counsel's lack of understanding of the Examining Attorney's rejection. In reviewing the specification relative to the drawings, the applicant cannot find any specific reason why the Examiner could not follow the specifications with the drawings. The drawing's specification issues were not raised in the December 19, 2005 Office Action and it appears that the drawings and/or specification from another case may have been placed with this file to possibly create a source of confusion at the Patent Office.

Conclusion

Since the drawings originally submitted were not handwritten, the applicant is thoroughly confused by the April 3, 2006 Office Action. The applicant has certainly undertaken efforts to address each of the issues raised. Perhaps a telephone discussion would be appropriate to clarify the issues with the applicant's attorney would be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 20, 2006

Stephen L. Stark

Attorney for Applicant,

MILLER & MARTIN PLLC Suite 1000 Volunteer Building

832 Georgia Avenue

Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402

(423) 756-6600

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope with sufficient first-class postage addressed to:

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

on this day of

()

2886476_1.DOC